

B X

1767

S 75

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. BX 1767

Shelf 575

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.



1
122
2,00

THE CLAIMS

OF THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

EXAMINED,

AND

TESTED BY SCRIPTURE.

✓
BY REV. STEPHEN SPOCHYNSKI.

Late Priest of the Roman Catholic Church of Paterson,

NEW-JERSEY.

PATERSON, N. J.

T. WARREN, PRINTER, VAN HOUTEN-STREET.

1853.



BX 1767
S15

ADVERTISEMENT.



The following brief and unpretending treatise is the work of a Polish gentleman, who for ten months has ministered as Priest to the Roman Catholic congregation of this city. He has been but little more than a year in this country. But soon after his arrival, he felt the influence of our free institutions; and though sympathising with that portion of his people who were disposed to maintain the rights of the churches against the usurpations of the Hierarchy, he became deservedly the favorite of those who had been committed to his care. It is known that the priesthood in Poland have but little regard for the claim of the Pope to be Universal Bishop, and that to an extent which is unknown amongst those in other lands, they assert the rights of conscience. Mr. Spochynski, on coming to America, was not disposed to surrender this prerogative; and on one occasion ventured to attend a lecture delivered in the Cross-street Church of this city, by the Rev. Mr. Welsh, an Evangelist of the American and Foreign Christian Union. On his return, he narrated to his brethren, the Priests, the substance of the lecture, with which he was much pleased. They hereupon remonstrated; and upon his persisting to maintain his right to hear and to think for himself, they proceeded to enter a complaint to Archbishop Hughes. Mr. S. was, thereupon, invited to the Arch-episcopal Palace; and other means were resorted to in order to recover him from his *error*; but in vain. He maintained not only his right to think for himself, but also that the errors of the Papal church demanded of him as an honest man the step which he had taken. Such language of course could not be tolerated in the Romish communion, and consequently he was ex-communicated. Previous to this, however, a large number of his people petitioned the Archbishop on his behalf; but their warm attachment to Mr. S. seemed only to render a prompt sentence of ex-communication the more necessary. It was consequently, we are informed, carried into effect. Mr. S. had of course expected all this, and was fully prepared for it. Since his arrival in this country

he had been studying our language with great earnestness and assiduity ; and in consequence of the misrepresentations of the priesthood concerning him, he addressed through the *Paterson Intelligencer* several letters to his late flock. The first two of these are subjoined in an appendix. They produced a great effect upon the people, who had been accustomed to regard him as their Intercessor with God ; and being urged by them to prepare a summary of his views on the leading points of difference between Popery and Protestantism, he has prepared the work which is now presented to the public. The foreign idiom may occasionally be detected in his language, but we have thought best to suffer it to remain uncorrected, except in cases where the sense was thereby rendered obscure. Of the argument we need not speak—it will speak for itself. It is entirely his own, and we do not apprehend that it will be very soon answered. The priesthood, we presume, will treat the book as they have treated its author ; but the people will read it ; and we earnestly commend it to the careful perusal of our Roman Catholic brethren throughout the land.

Circumstances which need not be here detailed having brought Mr. Spochynski into intimate connexion with ourselves, we take great pleasure in thus introducing himself and his little work to the public.

ROBERT W. LANDIS,

Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church.

M. E. ELLISON,

Pastor of Cross-st. Methodist Episcopal Church.

PATERSON, New Jersey, Nov. 20, 1853.

CHAPTER I.

Infallibility Destroyed, and the Church of Rome Overturned.

1. We believe there is a God possessed of all possible perfections ; who never makes that to be false which is in itself true, or that to be true which is in itself false. To deny this, would be blasphemy.

2. That he requires of his rational creatures nothing that is impossible, but things rational and possible. To deny this, would be to say, he is cruel and unjust, and would be blasphemy.

3. Of those whom he has favored with a divine revelation of his *will*, such as Jews and Christians, he requires that they should be diligent to know it, according to their several abilities. Thus acting, they are saved. But to neglect this to please any man, or indulge their own corrupt hearts, is at their own peril and self-condemnation. The gospel directs the heavy-laden and self-despairing sinner to Christ, and directs us to look up to the Father of mercies for the aid of the Holy Spirit, to enable us to believe in Him with all our heart, which, when done, the repenting sinner is instantly justified by faith ; the curse, guilt and grief pass away ; and the peace of God succeeds, and sweetly overflows and comforts the soul ! And the love of God being shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, his joy is then unspeakable ! Such are born again, and their misery is turned into felicity, which will never forsake them so long as they walk obediently, even till they arrive in heaven.

4. Of all those to whom he has not vouchsafed an immediate revelation of his *will*, he only requires diligent attention to the abilities they have—to reason and con-

science, and the best light they can attain according to their circumstances. Thus, they are in their degree safe. To deny this, or any of these propositions, would be to blaspheme, because it would be saying: God requires impossibilities.

Thus every truly sincere follower of Christ, every conscientious Christian, however he may happen to differ from another, must be saved. Thus, the nations of the world also, it is evident, are through mercy not excluded; nay, are accepted. Acts 10. v. 35, "But in every nation, he that feareth Him, and works righteousness, is acceptable to him." Thus none in the world can be lost or damned, but he who through wilful neglect or wilful sin damns himself.

But the Church of Rome, choosing unhappily quite another way than the gospel, fixes upon a strange guide indeed, even *infallibility*, which she claims exclusively; and by which, with her other peculiar doctrines, such as *transubstantiation*, &c. &c., she, through the weakness of deluded Princes, by the Inquisition, that engine of mischief to man, and by many other evil arts, has from age to age filled the world with massacres, miseries, destruction and wo! Oh! what a fearful gospel is this *infallibility*!

Now, it is very manifest to the eye of sober reason, that these her peculiar doctrines, the result of great talents, and of much labor and perseverance, were all framed to exalt and enrich the clergy, and bring the people, from the prince to the peasant, all, into the most abject submission to them. By *infallibility*, they persuaded them "they alone had the true and safe church, out of which *all* must be damned; they alone had a right to interpret Scripture and regulate the faith of all Christians." By *transubstantiation*, they would show forth the power and honor they had received from Christ, even *to create Christ himself on their altars*, and in this, to be above angels, and even the Virgin Mary; "for unto them

was it not granted, but unto the hierarchy of the Church," as says Gabriel Biel, in his 4th lesson on the Canon of the Mass. And by the public worship given to their host or wafer, even the same that is given to God! They confirmed this idea of their very wonderful power. By penances, auricular confession, and absolution, they came at the people's secrets, even of the most indelicate nature, with their circumstances, which, by the decree of the Council of Trent, they were obliged to confess; and then they must submit to the penances laid on them at the will of the clergy, else they could have no absolution, and consequently no salvation. By purgatory, indulgences and masses for the dead, they would show their power with God in the other world as well as in this, and thus make a gain of the people in the other world also. By holydays, which they themselves made, in flat opposition to God, who said, "*six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work;*" by forbidding the marriage of relatives not forbidden in Scripture, and many other such things, they raised themselves thus above the Scriptures, and taught the people to come to them most submissively, to ask leave to do what God has never forbidden. Yes, to be permitted to work on the holyday, or to eat flesh in Lent, or be married to some relative, for which they must by all means pay, and smartly too! Never was any people more injured.

St. Peter was Chief Pastor—Supreme Head, and should be obeyed.

For Jesus says: "Simon, I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren," lest any of them fall, shamefully fall, like thee. Peter then being warned of his danger by his Lord, should have prayed to him for divine aid, that his *faith* might not fail. For when divine promises are given to men, unless we inquire of the Lord to fulfil them, they shall profit us nothing, (Ezek. 36, v. 37.)

but rather increase our condemnation! And when he was restoring him to his forfeited office, he, in contrast to the three times in which he had denied and dishonored him, asks him three times, "Simon, lovest thou me?" Peter, feeling this *sharp* though tender reproof, answered with *grief*, "Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee." Then Christ says, Feed my sheep and my lambs, i. e. my old and new followers, and no more by such conduct dishearten or destroy them, but feed and encourage them by thy example, doctrine, and even by suffering death for my name. The keys (or commission) given to preach the gospel, and regulate Christ's kingdom or Church according thereto, were given to all the Apostles equally, (John 20, v. 21, 23.) As the Father has sent me, I also send you, &c. Where then in all this is there any ground for supremacy? The Apostles saw none.

Christ would not allow of any headship among them, but taught them that they were all equal. Be ye not called Rabbi, (*master*,) for *one is your Master*, even Christ, and *all ye are brethren*. Thus, if St. Peter himself had no infallibility nor supremacy, as is fully proved that he had not, then, for the Pope to lay claim to it, is most ridiculous, and is such an imposition as none but the silliest dupe will countenance. St. Gregory the Great, a Pope of Rome, (about the year 594,) in his letter to John, Bishop of Constantinople, who first sought the supremacy, and to be called *Universal Bishop*, says, it is *anti-christian*, *blasphemous* and *diabolical* for any bishop to assume the title of *Supreme Head*, and heresy and losing of the *Faith*. Thence it is pretty evident that St. Peter had nothing to do with it. Yet in a few years, (in 606,) his own successor, Boniface III, by the aid of the Emperor Phocas, (being incensed against Ciriacus, Bishop of Constantinople, who had assumed the title *Sovereign Pontificate*, granted to the Roman Bishop,) took this very title, which Gregory called

execrable. Thus has a Pope of Rome, with great point and accuracy, more than twelve hundred years ago, marked the distinct character of the man of sin, the son of perdition, as being a Christian Bishop with an army of priests, taking to himself in his pride the title *Universal or Sovereign Pontiff*. Who can doubt, therefore, that he is the Anti-Christ?

CHAPTER II.

Peter is not the Rock.

Jesus asked his disciples: "Whom do men say that the son of man is?" But they said: "Some John the Baptist, and other some Elias," &c. Jesus saith to them, "But whom say ye that I am?" (Matt. 16, v. 15. And Simon Peter answered and said, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God," (v. 16.) And Jesus said unto him, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father, which is in Heaven, (v. 17.) And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Its meaning is as follows: "Blessed art thou, Simon, for while mistaken men judge me to be only a prophet, my Father has showed thee, that I am the Christ. This is the only foundation, which has been from the beginning of the world, and was *that* of the prophets. Eph. 2, vs. 20, "Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;" and Peter 2, v. 4, 6, "Unto whom coming, as to a living stone;" v. 6, "behold I lay in

Sion a chief corner-stone, and he that shall believe in him, shall not be confounded." "And on this very foundation or *rock*, which thou hast now confessed, "Thou art Christ, the son of the living God," will I build my church, in which thou also, Peter, shall be a principal builder and lively stone, as shall thy fellow apostles, and to thee with them. (John 20, v. 21, "as the Father has sent me, I also send you." I give the keys of true doctrine and discipline. Luke 11, v. 52. "*Wo ! to you, lawyers, for you have taken away the key of knowledge : you yourselves have not entered in, and those that were entering in you have hindered,*") "and against this my church of holy, persevering, obedient believers in every age, shall the gates of hell never prevail."

Then we see: 1st. The rock to be Christ. 2d. His church, true believers. 3d. Their security, his promise. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against them." This proof of *Scripture* is first from St. Peter himself. 1 Peter, 2 v. 6, 8. Behold I lay in Sion a chief corner-stone, (or rock, v. 8,) elect, precious: and he that believes on *Him* shall not be confounded." Here, as above, we have: 1. The foundation, the rock, Christ. 2. His church, believers on *Him*. 3. The promise they shall not be confounded; or, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against them."

2d. John 10, v. 27, 28. "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hands." Here again, the foundation is Christ, and his voice or gospel. 2. His church; they who hear and follow him. 3. They shall never perish; or "the gates of hell, &c."

3d. Mat. 7, v. 24, 25. Therefore, whosoever hears these sayings of mine, and does them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the

winds blew, and beat upon a rock." Here we see, 1. Christ and his doctrine is the rock. 2. The church, all obedient believers cleaving to him alone, like the man's house built upon the bare rock. 3. The storms and floods, i. e. "the gates of hell shall not prevail against them;" here is no mention of St. Peter, or of any secondary rock. And St. Peter himself supports it. 1 Peter 2, v. 6, 8, "Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner-stone" &c., and St. Paul says to the Cor. ch. 3, v. 11, "For other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid: which is *Christ Jesus*. Thus, we must be in agreement with St. Peter and Paul, and with Christ our Lord, and the whole Scriptures, and say that St. Peter was not the rock or foundation of the church, but Jesus Christ. Therefore, to say that the Bishop of Rome or any other, is the *foundation or rock and head* of Christ's church, is heresy and a losing of the *Faith*.

Now, let us consider these arguments against the infallibility of the church of Rome and the supremacy of her Popes, and ask ourselves, is there a particle of truth in these claims, so distracting to the world, and so destructive as they are to the souls and bodies of men? And as it most clearly is not of God, it must follow that it is of satanic origin, and of the very "spirit of proud anti-christ," as says Gregory the Great. It is *anti-christian*, *blasphemous* and *diabolical*. And thus the church of Rome is overturned, and her claim to *infallibility* built on a falsehood.

CHAPTER III.

Purgatory a Flgment.

No well informed Pope or Priest ever did or ever can believe in Purgatory.

That there is no *Purgatory*, but that it is a mere invention of the Romish church, to enrich the clergy and to frighten the ignorant, and keep the people in subjection, appears evidently from the following reasons :

The thing is encumbered with so many and such inextricable difficulties and absurdities, that it must be dismissed as contrary to all common sense. Although the council of Trent, in the "*Forma Fidei*," and in the "*Decretum de Purgatorio*," obliges her clergy to *swear, constantly to hold, and most diligently to teach, that there is a purgatory, &c.*," yet in the face of all this, many of her most learned and eminent divines, have had the candour and courage to leave it on record for posterity, that no such thing can at all be proved.

Bishop Fisher says, in *Confut. Luth.* art. 18, "many are tempted now-a-days not to rely much on *indulgences*, for this consideration, that the use of them appears to be new and very lately known among Christians. To which I answer, it is not very certain who was the first author of them ; the doctrine of purgatory was a long time unknown, was rarely if at all heard of among the ancients, and to this day the Greeks believe it not, nor was the belief of either purgatory or indulgences so necessary in the primitive church as it now is ; so long as men were unconcerned about purgatory, nobody inquired after *indulgences*." Thus we see, the bishop confesses, "*purgatory and indulgences were neither known nor necessary in the primitive or pure church.*" A notable confession this from a *papal doctor* ! "*Indulgences are now, though not of old, necessary.*" Necessary for what ? why, for enriching the clergy, to be sure, that, these being sold, and masses said, money

might thus be raised ; and so *indulgences*, and a *purgatory* out of which tormented souls might be thus released, are then luckily, or rather wickedly thought on, as a fit expedient for this end ! But of indulgences more hereafter.

Otto Frising, an old historian and a Roman Catholic Bishop, tells us, "the *doctrine of purgatory* was built upon the credit of those fabulous dialogues attributed to Gregory I, about the year 600." And for the prayers made to deliver souls from *thence*, we are told by Roman authors, "that the first who caused them to be appointed by the church of Rome, was *Odillo*, Abbot of Clugny, in the year 1000." (Ranul, Higden, Polychron, l. 6. c. 15, Petrus Damian, Vit.)

The ancient fathers knew nothing of *purgatory*. St. Augustine, it is true, once had some debates in his mind about it, when he wrote his Questions, *de octo dulcitiis*. But on maturer examination he says, "we read of heaven and of hell, *but the third place we are utterly ignorant of; yea, we find it not in the Scriptures.*" "Nor will any thing help thee, but what is done while thou art here. As the last day of man's life finds him, so the last day of the world shall hold him." Gregory Naz. says, in *Encomio Cæsaris*, "That the souls of good people, when they are freed from the body, do forthwith enjoy an incredible pleasure, and joyfully fly unto the Lord." St. Patrick writes, "*Tria sunt habitacula sub omnipotentis Dei nutu.*" "Three abodes there are under the government of Almighty God ; the first is heaven, second hell, third this world. In hell none are good, in heaven none bad. The servants of God go to God, and the servants of the devil to the devil."

And yet the priests now persuade the people that their masses and prayers will avail in the other world ! And is this, indeed, your judgment, O ye ancient godly men, that there was not in your days any purgatory ? But were you now in the world ye might learn another les-

son ; ye might see thousands of masses, &c., &c., going forward, pretending to release poor souls out of it. It is now that men are wise !

"Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis."

"God's holy *truth* was loved and taught of old,
But *times* are changed—now *lies* are taught for gold."

The Holy Scriptures afford no room for purgatory. Christ our Lord says : "There are twelve hours in the day, when men ought to work ; work while ye have the day, for the night cometh when no man can work : " when the night of death cometh, the die is cast forever ; the destiny is fixed, never more to be revoked. St. Paul tells us, "If our earthly Tabernacle were dissolved, we have a house eternal in the heavens." And again, "when we are absent from the body, we are present with the Lord." So, not in purgatory, unless it will be affirmed, the Lord is in purgatory. Now, God has promised, "full forgiveness to returning sinners, and that their sins shall never be mentioned," Ezek. 18. But did he afterwards punish them in purgatory, it would be to deceive them. Therefore it must follow : 1. Either that God is not good, or these *purgatory preachers*, to serve their own ends, have miserably blasphemed him. 2. That Christ's satisfaction is not complete, or these teachers are false : for that only is perfect to which nothing needs be added. 3. That remission of all sins is not altogether a free gift, as we, *in part at least*, satisfy for them ourselves. 4. That Christ is not our only Redeemer from all sins ; for by penances, mortifications, indulgences, masses, or in purgatory, we atone for some ourselves. 5. That if, by some doings or sufferings of our own or of others, any sin can in any part be satisfied for, then an increase of these must satisfy for more, and at length all might be thus satisfied for. If so, the death of Christ was consequently needless, as St. Paul argues, to the Galatians, ch. 4, "*Christ has freed us from the servitude of the law,*" and in the verse 31, "*So then, brethren, we are*

not the children of the bond-woman, but of the free : by the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free." Thus to assert any of these things is evidently blasphemous. Therefore, to teach the doctrine of human merit, or of a purgatory in which we can atone for any sin, is in effect to teach *blasphemy* !

Thus is it manifest, from reason, scripture, ancient fathers, and from many eminent Papal writers, &c., that there is no ground whatever for believing in the existence of a purgatory.

CHAPTER IV.

Indulgences.

The council of Trent teachers, "that after God has justified the penitent sinner by his grace, and remitted the guilt of eternal punishment, yet *his sin is not so wholly blotted out* but that there still remains the *guilt of temporal punishment* due to Divine justice, which debt the pardoned sinner must discharge, either in this life by *penance*, &c., or hereafter in *purgatory*, before he can enter the "kingdom of heaven." And "the Council farther teaches, that Christ has given to his church the power of granting *indulgences*, which extend to this very debt or satisfaction, and by which she can remit it wholly or in part in certain circumstances. And that the use of them—of these *celestial treasures*, is very *salutary* to the faithful, and must be retained in the church."

This pretended *guilt of temporal punishment*, of which the gospel teaches nothing, is the ingenious, impious, and sole foundation of purgatory, indulgences, jubilees, prayers and masses for the dead, and of all the Babel building of the church of Rome. Here are her *celes-*

tial treasures ! Thus she can contrive to plunder the foolish, by remitting part or the whole of this preposterous and fraudulent debt, a debt founded wholly in falsehood. When the publican, the adulteress that great sinner, the thief on the cross, the prodigal, the very murderers of Christ, were forgiven, it was fully ; no debt of temporal guilt remained to them, nor was any priestly penance imposed. But the Priests teach the people, that the soul must suffer in proportion to its debts. Suffer where ? *Why in purgatory.* "For souls in purgatory, departed in Christ, but not fully purged, the sacrifice of the altar is to be offered, to relieve and release them." But the *indulgence remits the debt at once, as above.* Then masses and indulgences alternately destroy each other : for if masses release souls, what need is there of indulgences ? and if an indulgence will do, what need of masses ? Again, if Christ be in the mass, as the Priests say, "in the mass is soul, body, and divinity," and that many masses are offered to release a soul out of purgatory, yet, when "the pope's indulgence does it at once," then it will conclusively follow that an indulgence is above all these masses, and therefore superior to Christ, and the Pope, who is sole author of the indulgence, must therefore be very far above Christ, and of course be the anti-christ, the man of sin. But the indulgence may be had for a few shillings, hence must it also follow that these few shillings for which it can be had are better than the mass sacrifice, i. e. than Christ, soul, body, and divinity ! Solve this who can. So Christ, by this papal doctrine, is made to be of less value than a few shillings ! Even Judas and the high priests did not rate him at so low a price. See now what the pope's doctrine leads to,—even to blasphemy and immediate infidelity !

If the pope's indulgences can thus release souls from purgatory, why does he not at once release them all ?

Our Lord asks the Pharisees, "if an ox, an ass, or a sheep fall into a pit, which of you will not lift it out? And is not a man better than a sheep?" But it seems the Pope is of another mind, and deems an ass better than a man; for he has less pity for men, whom he leaves burning in *purgatory*, than they for an ass or sheep, which they would not leave in the pit one day. Now, to keep men in torment—to detain them there till the money is paid for them, is it not to act like Satan? And why does not the Pope keep himself out of it? for, the many masses offered for him after his death, which are never intended for those in heaven or in hell, *proclaim that he is himself gone to the flames of purgatory!* And if he was *grand treasurer of the church*, how is it, that he could not find as much *spiritual treasure* in it, even one indulgence, as would keep himself from torment? So, it is evident that he knew *his indulgences were mere deceptions!*

Nor was *money alone* in abundance thus obtained by these indulgences, but also by them soldiers were procured to fight for the Popes. Gregory VII., by his legate, grants to those who would fight against the Emperor Henry IV., the full *remission of all their sins*. Pope Victor III., granted the same to those who would fight against the Saracens. And Alexander III., in the twelfth century, grants the same, and "an eternal reward to all who would fight against the Albigenses," because they would rather obey Christ and his Gospel than the Pope. Thus did Pope Calixtus II., anno 1122; Eugenius in 1145; Clement III., in 1195, &c.

That indulgences and purgatory are but mere frauds, is gathered even from papal doctors. Cardinal Cajetan writes thus in 2d chapter of Indulgences: "If we could have any certainty concerning the origin of *indulgences*, it would help us much in the disquisition of the truth of *purgatory*; but we have not by writing any authority either of the Holy Scriptures, or ancient doc.

tors, Greek or Latin, which afford us the least knowledge thereof." And Alphonsus de Castro writes : " Many things are known to us, of which the ancients were altogether ignorant, as *purgatory, indulgences, &c.*" The voice of inspiration is : " If we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than that we have preached, let him be accursed." " If any man shall add to the words of this book, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Gal. 1, v. 8, Rev. 22, 18, 19.

• We have just seen, by the confession of several learned papal cardinals and doctors, that indulgences were neither taught nor practised by Christ or his apostles, nor in the primitive church, but are of modern invention ! These, then, being held up as " replete with grace and salvation," are therefore *a new gospel*, a gospel which the apostles or ancients knew not. Hence, instead of being the vehicles of all these blessings, must they not, if the apostles spake truly, be the very contrary,—be curses to all concerned in them ? And is it not most strange that now, in the nineteenth century, the same darkness should continue which prevailed in the dark ages, and that men of sense and learning should not be terrified at such divine denunciations hanging over their heads, and cease from these lamentable deceptions !

If a doctrine be promulgated as from God, to the children of men, and as replete with all these inestimable blessings, graces, and certain salvation, and if yet it be found that this doctrine or these directions so laid down did not in any wise proceed from God, must it not then clearly follow, let the temporal gain made thereby be ever so great, that the whole is from the

grand enemy of God and man, the father of lies. It is as well blasphemy against Christ as it is an imposture on men to their utter ruin ? and those who are occupied in promulgating such doctrines and practices, cannot in this be the "*ministers of Christ, nor be animated by his spirit,*" but are the direct opposite ? This is granted by papal doctors themselves. "*That Church,*" says Dr. Manning : "*That would teach any doctrine but that taught by Christ and delivered by his apostles, would not be the chaste spouse of Christ, but an HARLOT, and the school of SATAN.*" Short Method. p. 29, 59.

Hence it demonstrably follows, that this doctrine of indulgences is from "*the school of Satan,*" and that all who propagate these impostures, are therefore by no means the ministers of Christ. And therefore the pope of Rome and his preachers should instantly repent, make restitution, give back the people's money thus obtained, and ask pardon of Christ for having taught such *delusive* doctrines, and teach them no more.

CHAPTER V.

Transubstantiation an Impossibility.

Our Lord and Redeemer, who cannot lie, said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." John 6, v. 53. And at his last supper with his disciples : "Take, eat, this is my body ;" surely all this must be no metaphor, but *reality*. Hence, he must have converted the bread *really* into his body, and the wine into his blood. And Protestants themselves do confess, "they receive the *body and blood of Christ verily and indeed in the Lord's supper.*" What, then, can be plainer that it is the *real* body and blood of Christ which are meant ?

Answer.—1. That the bread and wine did, in *some sense*, become his body, none of us deny ; but that it became his *natural body*, as it involves a self-contradiction, we all must deny, or give up Christianity as a falsehood. When it is considered that the Scriptures, as did also the ancient fathers, take the body of Christ in five several senses, the difficulty at once ceases, namely : 1. His natural body, born of his mother. 2. His mystical body, or church. 3. His glorified and impassible body. 4. His sacramental or figurative body ; and, 5. His celestial body. I say, this solves the difficulty, and leads us to discover what that body was which he gave to his disciples. 1. It could not have been his *natural body*, for then it would follow that he ate himself and drank himself, and that each of his disciples did so likewise, and yet that neither did so, for he remained un-eaten ; and again, that his human body was then made, and of course did never exist before ; whereas it had existed for many years before : all which involving many self-contradictions or falsehoods, would subvert Christianity. 2. It was not his mystical body, the church, (Eph. 1, v. 23,) for to eat his church was impossible. 3. It was not his glorified body, for this was also impossible, because his body then was not spiritual and impassible, but had flesh and bones, which our Lord and St. Paul affirm a spirit hath not, (Luke 24, v. 39.) 4. Nor was it that body that was eaten only by the mind ; *living bread* which came down from heaven, which is eaten by faith only ; and as it nourishes the soul, could not consist of matter, as the fathers say ; but, 5. It was his *commemorative, sacramental, or figurative body*, of which himself ate, and gave them. This it must have been, since to suppose any of the others would involve self-contradiction, and therefore infidelity ! This solution is *plain and easy* ; and as it involves no contradiction or opposition to reason and Scripture, it must be true, and to this sense the best

writers as well as all antiquity agree, as shall presently appear. This they have done, or entangled themselves in endless contradictions and become infidels !

2. When our Lord called himself "a rock, a morning star, a door, a true vine, a shepherd," &c., though he spake truly, yet it was not literally ; or when he calls Herod a fox, John the Baptist Elias, the disciples his mother, St. John her son, &c., it was not strictly so, for he did not really convert the disciples into his mother, nor his mother into St. John's mother, nor Herod into a fox, &c. ; nor will it be said when he called the sacramental *cup* the *new testament*, that he indeed converted it into a testament : if not, why is it insisted that he converted the sacramental bread into his real natural body ? seeing this sense, as it necessarily is subversive of Christ's gospel and kingdom, is conclusively and deeply anti-christian.

But as our Lord's blood was the *seal* of the new testament, and also of all the promises and benefits contained in it, so was the wine a *sign of his blood* to be shed ; and it was given as such to the disciples, and as a seal of that covenant, afterwards confirmed by his blood when it was really shed. But his own natural blood was not then shed, unless it will be madly affirmed that it was shed before it was shed, or before he had suffered. Hence his cup or wine being a *sign* which represented the blood to be shed, got the name of the thing it signified. Again, Christ gave his body to his disciples as *broken*, but this being before his death, it was really whole and unbroken ; hence it was the bread, not his natural body, which was *broken*, and given as a *symbol* of his body, which was to be broken. So that it was *broken bread* which he really gave, and not his *natural body*. But the bread was a *sign* of his body, and therefore called his body, because it *signified* it. Hence these words must necessarily be taken *figuratively*, and in the words ; "This cup is the new

testament in my blood," there is a twofold *figure*. 1. The cup is put for the wine contained therein. 2. That which is contained in it is called the covenant, or testament, because it is the symbol or *sign* of it." Thus the blood is called the new testament, as circumcision is called the covenant, because it *represents* or is a *figure* of that covenant. What can be more conclusive than this ?

Dr. Aquinas, (on 1 Cor. 11. v. 24, 25,) saith : " by that which is contained in *this cup* is made a *commemoration* of the New Testament, which is confirmed by *Christ's blood*."

Scotus, the subtile doctor, in Dist. 11. 9, 3, saith : " there is no place to be found in the Scripture that may compel a man to believe the transubstantiation, had not the church so determined it."

Cardinal Cajetan (in his notes on Aquinas) writes : " The other point which the gospel has not expounded expressly, that is, the conversion of bread into the body of Christ, we have received from the church. That conversion is not found explicitly in the gospel."

Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, (Contr. Captiv. Babylon, c. 10, n. 2,) openly declares, " that there is not one word in the institution, from whence the *true presence of the flesh and blood of Christ*, in our mass, can be proved."

Vasquez, Ocham, Alphonsus de Castro, Erasmus, Durand, Taperus, Gabriel Biel, Melchior Canus, Cardinal Contarenus, &c. &c., are of this judgment.

Our Lord says, John c. 6, v. 32, 33 : " My father gives you the true bread from heaven ; for the bread of God is he which comes down from heaven, and gives *Life* unto the world. 35. I am the bread of *Life* : he that comes to me shall never hunger, and he that believes in me shall never thirst. 51. I am the living bread which came down from heaven ; if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever : and the bread that

I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the *Life* of the world. 52. The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying, how can this man give us his flesh to eat ? 53. Jesus said unto them, verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. 54. Whosoever eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. 55. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. 56. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. 62. What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up, where he was before. 63. *It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing ;* the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life."

From these words of our Lord we learn, that this *living bread* (or *meat*, or *eternal life*, by a figure called *flesh and blood*, because procured by his sacrifice on the cross,) came down from heaven. But his natural body was born on earth, and the sacrament was made of earthly matter, therefore, that *living bread* could not be the sacrament ; and by that *flesh and blood* or *living bread*, was meant not the *sacrament*, but that *grace* without which none can be saved. To come to Christ, to believe on him, is to eat and drink him, or his *flesh and blood*, and have our hunger and thirst appeased forever ; but this is done by faith, by hearing, by the mind, and not by the mouth of the body, as St. Austin (Tract 25,) saith, "*Quare paras dentes et ventrem ? crede, et manducastis.* Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and thy belly ? believe, and thou hast eaten." Therefore, it is not the material sacrament, thus received, which is here meant, but it is that "*inward and spiritual grace which is a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness.*" "*The flesh profiteth nothing to give life, but it is the spirit that quickeneth : the words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life.*" It is the Spir-

it, given us because of the atoning sacrifice, which alone works in us faith to lay hold on the words of promise, and imparteth unto us eternal life. If Christ cannot dwell in us, except we receive or eat him literally, it must follow, that to make us dwell in him, he must also eat us literally. How absurd is this doctrine ! Hence it is plain, that in the sixth of John, our Lord speaks not of eating the sacrament, but of a spiritual manducation or eating only, that is of grace received by faith. That this is so, is confessed by learned Popes and others, and also by the ancient fathers. How ignorant and foolish then are they who quote St. John to prove the *corporal presence* in the eucharist. Now, when the dogmas of the Papal church are found opposed, not only to the Protestant churches, but by consequence to all antiquity, and to Christ and his apostles, the conclusion is, that she must either abandon this and all her strange doctrines, or sink like a millstone in the flood. And also, the people must "come out of her" quickly, and join themselves to Protestant Churches, or make up their minds to sink with her eternally. For the Lord has decreed it, "If the blind lead the blind, they both shall fall into the ditch !"

As I am not conscious of any thing unkind or unfair in what I have written, and as I only intended to defend the holy and ancient religion of Christ, (but now overturned and destroyed by the Roman Church,) and also to do good to my fellow-men, if any man shall give a *fair and kind* answer to what I have written, and show me *TRUTH*—show me that I am mistaken—I *hereby promise I shall be of his religion*: for truth is what I regard,

CHAPTER VI.

The Sacrifice of the Mass.

The Council of Trent says : " I profess that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living, and for the dead."

The utter impossibility of transubstantiation having been demonstrated, this follows with it ; for, if there was no proper change of bread into the human body of Christ, there was no victim in that sacrament ; if not, that it ever was a *propitiatory sacrifice* was, and is, impossible !

1. The apostles Peter and Paul tell us, that Christ suffered *once*, and *only once*, upon the cross, for the sins of mankind, Pet. 3, v. 18. Hence there could be no *real propitiation* in the world, till that on the cross. Should they then, or any other being, once prove there was, it would contradict this Scripture record, and so tear up the very foundations of Christianity ; because the apostles would be found false witnesses, and if a *real sacrifice* was made for sin before Christ's death, it would render his death and merits needless ; and so the foundations of our religion would be destroyed. But the sacrament they call **THE MASS**, was before his death ; hence, the *mass sacrifice* must be subversive of christianity, and therefore be most impious and anti-christian. This one plain argument, even without more, must with every impartial mind, overturn the *sacrifice of the mass*, and pull down the whole edifice connected with it.

2. If there was no *real propitiatory sacrifice* before that on the cross, no sacrifice till then would be more than *typical* ; but the sacrament Christ gave, and which Paptists call the *first mass*, was before his death, therefore that sacrament could be no more than *figurative*. Hence, as no *real propitiation* was in that sacrament, and as none can be better than the first, then it follows,

that the sacrifice of the mass is an impossibility, and an impiety, and to teach it is anti-christian.

3. "A *real sacrifice* cannot be without the death or dissolution of the victim sacrificed." *Sacrificium verum et reale—Verum et realem occisionem exegit.* Belarmin de Missa, lib. 2, c. 27. But as Christ had not died at the time of the first mass or sacrament, nor dies in any mass, hence there can be no such *sacrifice* in any mass. Therefore, any such sacrifice, being impossible, is anti-christian. "But," says Dr. Challoner, "there is in the *mass a real destruction.*" Of what? Why, "*of the bread and wine, by consecration.*" What shameless mockery, falsehood, and imposition are here! Are bread and wine a living victim, slain or destroyed in this sacrament? That any rational creature should be duped by such palpable falsehoods is lamentable.

4. Did Christ offer himself *once a real sacrifice* in his sacrament, or first mass, as they call it? He did, or he did not. If he did, when he offered himself afterwards on the cross, he must then have offered himself *twice really*! or the mass sacrifice is false. But if he did not offer himself in that first mass, why, then, does the priest offer him in his mass? He cannot answer. Hence, such mass sacrifice is unwarranted, impious, and anti-christian.

The apostle Paul says, Heb. 9, v. 22: "Without shedding of blood, or a *bloody sacrifice*, there is no *expiation*, no remission of sins." The mass sacrifice is unbloody, but *applicatory* only, hence not expiatory. Again he affirms, v. 11, 12, 18: "Every priest indeed standeth daily ministering, and often offering the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But this man Jesus offering one sacrifice for sins, for ever sitteth on the right hand of God. Now where remission of sin is, there is no more offering for sin." Hence, if the apostle spake truly, there must be no more expiatory offering forever. Either, then, the mass expiatory sac-

rifice is unnecessary and must not be offered, or the apostle spoke falsely. To offer it, therefore, is to declare the apostle a liar, and the Scriptures also false, and so to subvert Christianity. Hence, the mass sacrifice is plainly and unavoidably subversive of christianity, and is therefore necessarily a system of infidelity. Besides this, the business of a real propitiatory sacrifice is not an application to men, but an *oblation to God*, by the vicarious suffering and death of the victim to atone for sin, that the guilt and punishment due to sin, may be removed and cleansed away, as says Bellarmine. But the mass sacrifice can be neither expiatory to God, for nothing is slain therein, nor applicatory to men, for that is not the business of a proper expiatory sacrifice. Hence, it is good for neither the one thing nor the other.

But if there is a *real proper sacrifice* in the mass, and the first mass was before Christ's death, then Christ's blood was shed at the sacrament before it was shed on the cross, and he was really dead in that sacrament, while yet he was not dead, but was alive, eating it with his apostles ! That is, he ate himself and drank himself, and each of his apostles ate him and then drank him ; and he offered himself in sacrifice, and so shed his blood and was dead, and then walked out into the garden with his disciples, and sang a hymn and prayed, and was apprehended, and condemned, and offered himself on the cross ; and therefore the sacrifice of the cross really took place at night, before it took place the day after ! O, the fearful absurdities of the mass ! O, ye "angelical divines," is this your doctrine ?

To close—seeing it is plain : 1. As there never was any *propitiatory sacrifice* for sin on the earth but ONE, even *Christ's death* ONCE on the cross, and that the sacrament he gave before it could not be propitiatory : 2. That he made no sacrificial oblation of himself at

the time of that sacrament; consequently that the *mass sacrifice* is impossible: and, 3. That no advocate, however great his abilities, has been ever able to defend it; for, being itself an impossibility, to them it was impossible, and therefore it has plunged them, every one, into the vortex of absurdity, nay, into the ditch: should not every man, then, who cares for his soul, as it must in the end ruin him, give it up at once?

When, at the day of my death, I look at Jesus Christ our Lord, whom I am most certainly to meet; at that *great white throne* before which I and my fellow-men must one day stand, to receive according to the deeds done in the body; at the books opened, and those deeds brought forth to public view; at the separation made between the righteous and the wicked, and the awful and irrevocable sentence that shall consign them to their several destinies; and at that fearful eternity that is to follow: when I survey all these certainties, it is little wonder, that all the powers of my soul should be alarmed before that God who sees me every moment and marks my every step. When I open my Bible, and see the following and such like declarations authorized by my great Judge, against false doctrines, idolatry, and wickedness: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. 1, v. 8. "Add thou not unto his words lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. 30, v. 6. "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." Rev. 22, v. 18. "Thou shalt not suffer sin upon thy neighbor: thou shalt in any wise reprove him." Lev. 19, v. 17. I say, when I behold all these warning truths now proclaimed to me and my fellow mortals from that lofty throne, where we shall most assuredly stand to receive our final doom; and when I consider that God knows that we are acquainted with these and such like passa-

ges, and feel also that I am accountable for them, what then is my duty? Is it not to obey God, and let the Romish Church condemn me? Hence, my beloved brethren, it is not from ill-nature, or to give pain to any man, that I write, but it is that by fair and friendly argument, I may lead men out of error unto God, that they may be saved; and that my own soul perish not.

CHAPTER VII.

The Worship of the Host Absurd and Idolatrous.

Since no christian can believe that God can lie, or that Christ and his apostles were wrong, and as the dogma, that Christ was corporeally in his sacrament, involves instant self-contradiction, so no intelligent pope, priest, or other person can believe that Christ was ever contained in the eucharist. Because Christ could not make his body to be in the sacrament and not in the sacrament at the same moment. And it is most clear from the gospel, that the term, *body*, was taken in several senses, and that he did not say of the bread, this is my *human body*, but left common sense to discern which it was he meant, then is it not most clear that his human body was never in the sacrament? His apostles worshipped himself, but did not worship the sacrament: hence they did not believe he was there, and, being inspired, they were not mistaken; and lastly, Christ gave the sacrament to be eaten, not worshipped. Therefore, he did not believe himself to be contained therein; and hence, as no man believes Christ was mistaken, or wrong, so can no well informed man believe that Christ was ever in any host, or that the worship of it is not *wrong*.

That the *host-worship* is a novelty, not known till

1216, is most plain, 1. Because that not till the year 1215, was transubstantiation, by the Council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III., made an *article of faith*, as Scotus, Tonsal, and others write ; so, before that, it was not worshipped. 2. In the Roman canon law, we find that it was Pope Honorius III., who the following year ordered that the priests at a certain part of the mass service should *elevate the host*, and cause the people to prostrate themselves to worship it ; and also about the year 1220, directed these words, "*Hic Deum adora*," "*worship God here*," to be written on the tabernacles in which the host was reserved for the sick.

The worship of the host was never taught by Christ or his apostles—is of modern invention—is contrary to our baptismal covenant, which binds us to his commands and example, and is therefore utterly subversive of the Christian religion, is condemned by the Scriptures, and by all argument, as the *most absurd doctrine*, and the most diabolical idolatry that ever appeared among men ; and is, in fact, no less than an agreement with Satan to secure the ruin of body and soul in hell, (of those who persist in it,) through the endless duration of eternity. Seeing, then, that these are facts and charges which cannot be disproved, and that neither can transubstantiation nor the sacrifice of the mass be supported consistently, by any power whatever, with truth and the religion of Christ, should they not all, in the name of God, be even now given up and dismissed forever by everybody who regards his soul ?

I shall bow my knees daily before God, that he may graciously open the eyes of his precious yet abused offspring, and turn them from these pernicious delusions, to the blessed, pure, and saving gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, that we all may finally meet together with joy, and not with grief, around his throne in glory, and escape that eternal misery which is prepared for all those who obey not the gospel—that *precious gospel*

which Christ, our Great Judge, has given us, to be a light unto our feet, and to lead us safely away from all the foolish and dangerous inventions of fallible man, into the peaceful paths of eternal life. Surely, you, my brethren, should not, cannot be displeased with me, for this my good will, and for labouring and studying for this noble end ; and thus contending day and night for the *Faith* of Jesus Christ, in order that this Old religion, which saves the soul from *sin and wrath*, and it alone, may prevail amongst us. While I behold the dishonor to God, and ruin to man, which *false doctrines* occasion, if I am led to speak strongly and even severely against them, it is not to injure or give pain to any man, but to clear my own conscience, to do my duty, and save my fellow-men from them and their consequences, even death eternal.

CHAPTER VIII.

Half Communion.

The word of God thus reads : " And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave to the disciples, and said—Take, eat, this is my body ; and he took *the cup*, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, *Drink ye all of it ; for this is my blood* of the New Testament, which *is shed* for many *for the remission of sins*. And they all drank of it." Mat. 26, v. 26, 29. Mark 14, v. 23. Luke 22, v. 20. 1 Cor. 11, v. 23–25. " He took the cup when he had supped, saying : *This cup* is the new testament in my blood, this do in remembrance of me ; for as often as ye eat this bread and *drink this cup*, ye do *show his death* till he come."

Here, it is fully evident, that our Lord, who is In-

finite Wisdom, hath by precept and example, taught and appointed *both the bread and cup* in the eucharist, not only before his death, but also after his ascension to heaven. For, St. Paul (v. 23) was taught the same, "to show his death till he come." And he (Paul) taught all christians, in every place, to do so likewise. 1 Cor. 1, v. 2 ; 11, v. 28, 29. And although from the beginning of the christian religion, the use of both kinds in the administration of the sacrament of the eucharist has been common, yet the Council of Trent, wickedly changed or condemned it, saying in these words: "If any one shall say, that all christians ought, by God's command, or for the sake of salvation, receive the most holy sacrament of the eucharist in both kinds, let him be accursed ! Can. 1.

We shall now listen to the testimonies of the early Fathers and others. Justin Martyr, anno 160 writes: "On the day commonly called Sunday, assemblies of citizens and countrymen are made, and the writings of the apostles and prophets are read ; the minister makes an exhortation after this, we all rise and pour out prayers, and *bread and wine* are brought forth, and the minister, to the utmost of his ability, sends forth prayers and praises to God, and all the people unite and consent, saying, *Amen*." Again: "They who are called deacons among us, give to every one that is present, of the consecrated bread and wine, even as Jesus commanded them to do." Apol. 2.

St. Cyprian, anno 230, says: "How shall we fit them for the cup of martyrdom, if, before it, we admit them not, by right of communion, to drink of the Lord's cup in the church ? Epist. 54, tom. i.

St. Ambrose—"It is an insult to the Lord to celebrate the sacrament otherwise than he did. For, he cannot be devout who presumes to give it in any other way than as it was given by its authors." In 1. Cor. 11.

Pope Gelasius, anno 492—"We find that some, hav-

ing received a portion only of the holy body, do abstain from the cup of the holy blood; who doubtless should receive the entire sacraments wholly, or should be driven from them wholly; because the division of one and the same mystery cannot be without very great sacrilege." Dist. 2, de consecrat.

Aquinas, anno 1260.—"Christ's body is not sacramentally under the species of wine, nor his blood under that of bread; therefore, that Christ may be received sacramentally, it is necessary to receive under both kinds." Alexr. Halens.

Cassander saith: "Concerning the holy sacrament of the eucharist, it is sufficiently known that the universal church to this very day, and even the *Roman* church, for more than a thousand years after Christ, did give both species of bread and wine to ALL the members of Christ's church, which is manifest from *innumerable* testimonies of ancient writers, both Greek and Latin; and they were induced to do so by the institution and example of Christ, who gave this sacrament of his body and blood to his disciples. Wherefore, it is not without cause that the best and most learned Catholics do most earnestly desire and contend that they may receive the sacrament of Christ's blood together with his body, according to the ancient usage." Consult. art. 22.

Archbishop Synge says: "I desire you to speak plainly and to answer me this question: was it at any time the practice of the universal church, or of any particular church, for one thousand years and more after Christ, that when Christians were assembled together for the purpose of the celebration of the holy communion, the species of bread alone was given to the people, or the cup withheld from the people? And if not, by what authority doth the church of Rome withhold the cup from the people?"

What can be more plain? Here we have a mass of

evidence from Scripture, antiquity, Papal divines, and even from the Councils themselves, that our Lord and Saviour did indeed institute and administer the eucharist in *both kinds*; and that for many ages afterwards the same was practised by all Christian churches, and that any attempt to separate the cup from the bread was looked on as great impiety, superstition, and sacrilege, nay, a direct insult to Christ, its founder; so that this is not disputable, but a plain matter of fact. To look, then, for reasons and arguments to combat such facts and justify the sacrilege of taking away the cup, is such infatuation as to confess the sun shines, and then to try to prove it shines not!

So, then, they confess: 1. "That our Lord gave both bread and cup, (and that after supper too,) and that this was the Christian usage for many ages," but now, "it is *an error* dangerous to salvation!" and thus do they at once condemn Christ and his Apostles! 2. They have found, that this mode of it left by our Lord is liable to many scandals and dangers. 3. They have made a discovery that escaped him and his apostles, namely: "that the whole Christ, body and blood, is in either the bread or the cup, of course that one is enough." (But it is proved that Christ was in neither.) 4. They affirm the Holy Ghost taught them all this! So, then, the Holy Ghost inspired them to charge Christ with error, and to subvert his sacred institution! Is there a thinking and sensible Romanist on earth, that on viewing all this, will not shudder and cry out, this is nothing short of blasphemy inspired by the devil? What! Councils to be infallibly inspired by God to overthrow his own gospel and institutions, and to set up the opposite! Who that cares for his soul, or loves the Lord his Saviour, can for a moment listen to such horrible impieties and anti-christian blasphemies!

When it is confessed that Christ, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, has instituted the eucharist in both

kinds, and after ascending to heaven, taught the same to St. Paul, (1 Cor. 11, v. 23;) and when it is certain that whosoever alters what our Lord thus appointed, is accursed of God, and that the system he substitutes is accursed also, and must therefore prove a curse to any who shall venture to follow it; who then that loves the Lord, or has any regard for his own salvation, can ever again use this corrupt invention, the half-communion? The Romish clergy knowing, as they must know, that the Lord never taught the host worship or half-communion, and that therefore these dogmas are idolatrous and accursed; the only alternative that is left to them is either to abandon such doctrines, or otherwise sink into infidelity and eternal despair.

When therefore transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, the worship of the host or wafer, and half-communion shall have been carefully examined by any candid man, must he not be constrained to own that they are such a compound of absurdity, blasphemy, idolatry,—in a word, such a complete system of impiety and religious deformity as the world never before witnessed.

CHAPTER IX.

Priestly Forgiveness of Sins.

If any could have had such a privilege, the apostles, to whom was spoken these words: "Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted," "what ye bind on earth," &c., &c. John 20, Matt. 16, 18, v. 18, must surely have had it; but if facts be the best expositors of words, and the apostles were the best judges of their commission, they had no such thing. I defy the whole world to bring any solid proof, that any apostle, or any of their dis-

ciples, ever assumed or exercised any authority whatever to forgive, on any account, any man's sins committed against God, farther than, 1. To preach the Gospel to them, and thus evince how they might obtain forgiveness from God. Hear our Lord Jesus Christ, and his apostles Peter and Paul, and be convinced: "It behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, that repentance and REMISSION OF SINS should be preached in his name among all nations." Luke 24, v. 47, 48. "And he commanded us," says Peter, "to preach unto the people, and through his name, whosoever believes in him shall receive REMISSION OF SINS." "Be it known unto you," saith Peter, "that through this man (Christ) is preached unto you the *forgiveness of sins*." Acts, c. 10, v. 42, 43—c. 13, v. 38. This is the only way to obtain real pardon. 2d. To exclude evil doers from their society, or to admit them again when they deemed them penitent, by forgiving, not *their sins against God*, but the censure of expulsion. See 1 Cor. v. 1, 5, and 2 Cor. c. 2, v. 7. Here the incestuous man is excluded and becoming penitent after, the apostle advises the society or church of the Corinthians "*to forgive him*," i. e., to admit him again, and comfort him, saying, "he also for their sakes forgave him, (this censure,) as did they." Or 3d, "That men should forgive each other personal offences, one against another," Luke 17, v. 3. Matt. c. 6, v. 14; c. 18, v. 15.

Hence, human absolution for sins against God, with its concomitants, auricular confession and penance, are but mere human inventions—fables—dangerous delusions. And the way of the Scripture of truth is the alone sure way of obtaining this invaluable blessing.—All who try it will so find it.

Priestly confessions and absolutions! God only knows what unnumbered mischiefs they have entailed on mankind! What secrets of men, women, families

and nations, have been obtained, in this way, and often for purposes most sinister! The dangers and evils attendant on secret or auricular confessions, are abundantly set forth and exposed by Nectarius and St. John Chrysostom, in whose days this usage was first introduced into the Christian church. A certain lady, having been seduced by *her confessor*, stung with remorse, owned the fact, and openly confessed her adultery!—This scandal so roused Nectarius, then Bishop of Constantinople, that he decreed, “*There must be no more of these private confessions;*” and St. Chrysostom, who succeeded him, ratified it; and in no less than thirteen places in his works, (as Bishop Burnet on article 25 testifies,) condemns the practice. “Hast thou sinned?” saith he, “thou needest no witness; confess thy sins to God, and he will forgive thee,” (Examination, &c.) “Let examination of thine offences be made in thought, lest this judgment be *without a witness*; let God only see thee making thy confession; God, who casteth not thy sins in thy face, but looseth them, &c. Hom. de penit. et confess. Again, I say not, that thou shouldst accuse thyself before man: But I say, obey the prophet, saying, “Reveal thy way to the Lord;” confess thy sins, therefore, before God.” Chrys. Ep. ad Heb. hom. 31.)

And our Lord says, “Enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret, to forgive thy trespasses,” Matt. c. 6, v. 6–12. So did the Holy Ghost, by David, teach, “I will confess my sins to the Lord,” &c., Ps. 32, v. 5. How wicked then were those who, opposing themselves to God, made a law that confession must be made to men!

Will not common sense itself teach the vast indelicacy and impropriety of such intimate connexions as this species of confession necessarily occasions, and its danger, not only to the people, but to the clergy also?

is dangerous to women, and to the young most especially, who, on their knees, at the feet of perhaps some young man of unbridled passions, must whisper to him, and, "*on pain of mortal sin and damnation,*" unfold to him *in secret* all the sinful practices and desires, of even an indelicate or immodest nature, with all their circumstances, into which temptation, in an unguarded hour, perhaps, might have involved them. It also must be dangerous to the clergy themselves, to deprive them of chastity, humility, and a good conscience. Do not many, by sad experience, feel the force of these observations? So sensible was the great and pious John Wickliffe, a priest himself, of the numerous evils flowing from it, both to clergy and people, that he ceased not to inveigh against it continually.

From the facts and arguments now before us, is it not most clear that neither Christ nor his apostles ever taught this sort of confession and absolution, &c., and that therefore they who teach it, or consent to it, do in effect plainly accuse Christ of neglect, and insult him to his face, as an imperfect or false teacher! which, if even the angels of heaven should do, they would be cast down to hell. And again, as the aforesaid holy bishops did in the fifth century forbid and reprobate all such private confessions, &c., and as of course, it was no sacrament in their day; it must therefore be a false doctrine now, opposed to Christ and his gospel, and must necessarily prove a curse to such as follow it. Consequently, all who regard their salvation, and who would not willingly insult their Saviour, should resolutely, and in the name of God, renounce it forever?

We may now see clearly, that all the priests and their Pope are absolutely obliged to own their pardons false; assuredly false. Because, a pardon that differs from a true pardon, is false. Christ's pardon is ever the same; it took the penitent thief to paradise, the third heaven, and therefore takes all who obtain it to the

same, at death. Now, masses are never intended for souls in heaven, but "for those detained in purgatory." But as masses are offered for the Pope when he dies, and for all Roman Priests, so he and they at death must have gone to purgatory, and not to heaven. Now, they receive papal absolution or pardon duly administered in life; and whereas they went not to heaven at death but to purgatory; (as the one brings the soul to heaven and the other to purgatory,) these pardons differing from each other, if Christ's pardon is true, the other must be false. It follows, then, that the priests, by every mass they say for their Pope or people, do, as with trumpet voice, declare, that they are in purgatory, and therefore that the pardons or absolutions which they have given them in life were absolutely fallacious!!! Resist this who can.

Again, since false pardons proclaim those to be *false prophets* who give them, and therefore, opposers of the gospel and of Christ, they of course are anti-christs; most conclusive then is it, that the assumption of those Priests and Popes of having power to dispense such absolutions, &c., necessarily constitutes them false prophets and anti-christs, and their chief **THE ANTI-CHRIST AND FALSE PROPHET**. And since he who needs most masses to rescue him from purgatory, must have been the greatest sinner; and as it is a fact, that no man leaves this world for whom so many masses are offered as for the Pope; therefore, their own doctrine makes the Pope to be *the greatest sinner that ever left the world*, according to the judgment of his clergy who say all those masses for him. But the greatest sinner must be the man of sin; hence his own doctrine concludes the Pope to be the man of sin. Now, as the premises and conclusions are inseparable, and the minor cannot be disputed, these men must abandon their doctrines, or be content to be regarded as the enemies of the truth of God, and the destroyers of souls.

APPENDIX.



To the Roman Catholic Congregation of Paterson, New-Jersey.

My dear Brethren and Sisters in Jesus Christ:—
Your anxiety about the welfare of my soul, obliges me to address you. Be not distressed about me, for I have learned the right way; but rather be solicitous for your own souls. God has chosen me to teach and proclaim his truth; and by his kind Providence has sent me into this country to my dear countrymen, as to sheep without a shepherd; who may say that “no man careth for our souls!” Probably no portion of the foreign population has been more completely overlooked and uncared for than the poor Polanders. And now not only Bishop Hughes, your earthly Ruler, (who has tried to silence me,) but no other power on earth shall hinder me from doing what duty calls me to do. Let glory be given to Almighty God, who has bestowed civil and religious liberty on this part of the world; and here no priest and no despot has a right to interfere with conscience.

Your priests endeavor to terrify you from reading the holy scriptures, by threatening you with the flames of hell. But believe them not. Our Heavenly Father gave us the Holy Bible to read and study; and sent his beloved Son who has shed his blood for us all. Hell is not for those who love and read the Bible, but it is for your priests, who like the wicked spirits, have revolted against God, and rejected his holy doctrine; and make Jesus Christ a foolish man by saying that he gave

us the Scriptures, but made them too obscure for us to understand. And thus your priests make you to stumble in darkness, by keeping you away from the word of life.

Read the Holy Scriptures through and you will find that Jesus Christ never constituted any man to be the Head of his church. Look into Ephesians, chapter 1, "Christ is the head of the church." So too in verses 22, 23, "And he (God) hath subjected all things under his (Jesus') feet; and hath made him head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." Consider what pride it is, what idolatry it is, for any man to pretend to be *the head of this body of Christ*, and so to assume to himself the honor belonging to God. If now Jesus were on the earth, not the Jews, but your priests, would cry out "crucify him! crucify him!"

Your priests say to you "Don't believe the protestants." And why? for Protestants believe and perform the doctrine of Jesus Christ, and Papists, like their priests, must reject that which Jesus Christ gave us to believe. No, you must not believe the word that Jesus Christ gave you, but you must believe the catechism which your priests give you: and therefore you must believe that Jesus Christ cannot save you, but that your priests can; and that they can by excommunication cast you into hell fire; and then when you entreat them and give them money for masses, they can get you out again.—But my beloved brethren, where is the fire of hell?—Your priests cannot tell you. God knows, but the priests do not know where it is; and how then will they get you out of it; or know when you are in or out of it. They talk of the 5th article of the creed, "He descended into hell." But why don't they honestly tell you that in this article *hell* means the *grave*, or the place of the departed. Ah, the reason they don't tell you is, because if you knew it you would not give

them money for their masses, and would not fear their silly and childish excommunications. *You give them your money—your hard earnings—and they laugh at your ignorance when you are gone from them.* Believe me, for I tell you the truth, my brethren.

I was obliged to be silent as long as I was under the tyrannic government of my own country; but when I arrived in this land of liberty, I could not be silent to the priest, on the subject of their great injuries to our Lord Jesus Christ. This made them angry; and they accused me to their Bishop, and to you. But you, my dear brethren, who had witnessed my conduct, wrote a good testimony about me to the Bishop; and you have been very much grieved that he has rejected your request. I pray you, say how many of you ceased to go to the church; and condemned the priests in the severest manner, since you were scandalized by them in the church, when they endeavored to take away the rights and liberties of the trustees of the church? Did you not cry out in the church when the eucharist was exposed on the altar, "YOU ARE NOT PRIESTS, BUT PHARISEES?" Then don't condemn me together with your Pharisees, but be converted to the true God. Don't bow before idols; but bow before your Lord God and Saviour, Jesus Christ, who has given us true directions how we must believe so as to save our souls.

God bless you all!

STEPHEN SPOCHYNSKI.

Polish Pastor.

Paterson, New-Jersey, October 15, 1853.

**To the Roman Catholic Congregation of
Paterson, N. J.**

Beloved Friends, to whom I wish salvation in the Lord Jesus Christ. In consequence of the cruel persecutions which I have suffered, and the falsehoods which have been told about me, because I dared to think for myself in this blessed land of liberty, it was necessary for me to address a letter to you a short time ago. And I am glad to know that that letter was considered with deep earnestness by you. Remember, I was one of your priests. You honored me, and I loved you. And do you think I love you the less because I set you the example of freedom from the slavish yoke of Rome, and renounced my errors? No, beloved brethren; I was once bound; but now, by the grace of God, I am free, and I wish to see my dear people free also. You know I have not gained anything in this world, but have lost much by doing so. I could still have lived by taking away from you, as the Priests do, your hard earnings for saying masses, and doing all those foolish rites of the Romish church, which do you no good, but put money into the pockets of your Priests. But I scorn to do it, for God has shown me by his blessed word the wickedness of all such practices.

I am glad, my beloved brethren, that you read my letter with so much care; and that you seek to know what true religion is, and what is false. Though these enemies of Jesus Christ, the Priests, seek to make merchandise of you, and by keeping away the truth from you, to ruin your souls. I care not for their rage and threats. My life is in the hands of God; and my adopted country, this glorious land of liberty, grants to me the freedom of speech. The truth is mighty, and it cannot be put down in this land, by fines, and tortures, and inquisitions, and gibbets. Have faith in God, and your faith will save you.

And now consider, brethren, whom you ought to obey? God or his enemies? Are they not the enemies of God, who say that the Holy Scriptures are not for the people to read? But I, who love you, and desire your eternal happiness as I desire my own, say to you, do not listen to them; but listen to Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and Prophets. Jesus says, "Search the Scriptures," John 6, 39. "Seek ye out of the Book of the Lord and read," also says the Prophet Isaiah, 36, 16. So too, "Blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it," Luke 11, 28. "This Book of the Law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night that thou mayest observe and do according to all that is written therein," Josh. 1, 8. Here is a command to the General of the Jewish Army to read and meditate on the Holy Scriptures. Again, "From a child thou hast known the Scriptures." See here, in the apostles' days, a child is approved and commended for being taught in the Scriptures; and now under the tuition of your priests, many grow old without knowing anything about them.—Again says the Lord Jehovah—"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you; neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you," Deut. 4, 2. Again says Christ Jesus, "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken the same shall judge him in the last day," John 12, 18. Paul also says, "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel," Rom. 2, 16.—Thus you can clearly see that we are obliged to hear and obey the words of Jesus Christ; and that we are to be judged by him *according to the Gospel*, and not according to the words of his enemies, the Priests; who, choosing unhappily another way than the Gospel, wher-

ever they have the power, fill the world with misery, massacre and wo!

By penances, and auricular confession, that engine of so many mischiefs to man, they come at the people's secrets, even of the most indelicate nature, and with all their circumstances ; and this not by the commandment of God, but by the decree of the Council of Trent. The poor deceived people are obliged to confess to the priests, and then submit to the penances laid upon them at the pleasure of the clergy, else they could receive no absolution, and consequently no salvation. By their pretended purgatory, their indulgences, and excommunications, and masses for the dead, they would show their power with God in the other world, as well as in this, and they make a gain of the people. By appointing holy-days which God has not appointed, and forbidding many things which are not forbidden in the Scripture, they have elevated themselves above our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the ONLY LAWGIVER OF HIS CHURCH ; and they instruct the people to come to them most submissively to ask for leave to do what God has never forbidden—such as to work on a holy-day, to eat flesh in Lent, &c.

But besides all this, I need only refer you, my Irish brethren, to the history of you own beloved native land. You know that Ireland was sold to England in A. D. 1156 by Pope Adrian III. He issued a bull in which he ordered Henry II. to invade Ireland ; whereupon Henry began to bring that country under the oppressive yoke of Rome. Thus was Ireland sold and her Independence overthrown, under the claim of the Pope to rule over all kingdoms, and people, and dispose of their liberties at his pleasure. But Jesus said, "*My kingdom is not of this world,*" John 18, 36. In the days of St. Patrick, who labored in Ireland, and died there in A. D. 460, the Church of Rome did not even pretend to have any such claim. And so late as A. D. 594, Gre-

gory the Great, the Bishop of Rome, said that "the claim to be a *universal Bishop* is *anti-christian, blasphemous, and diabolical*." Where, then, did they obtain the claim they now assert? There has been no new revelation from God since that period; and as the claim could not have come from God, it has come from the Devil. And yet, it is upon this diabolical claim that poor Ireland is oppressed as she is; and that your priests now in this land of liberty attempt to tear away your right to worship God according to the dictates of his word.

And here I must say a word respecting Archbishop Hughes. He claims to be an Irishman, and yet no man is more desirous of holding the free sons of Ireland, who now reside in this land of freedom, in the vilest servitude and chains than he. Not content with what they bore in Ireland, he must even enslave their souls and consciences here. You remember when he appeared in your church, as the ray of the sun after the darkness of night, and ascended his tribunal at the altar, *with his back towards it*, to reprove the congregation. He used these portentous words; "I KNOW MY PRIESTS, BUT I DO NOT KNOW THE CONGREGATION." Think of this, my brethren! Jesus Christ says, "*The good shepherd knows his sheep, and they know him*." Of course, then, Archbishop Hughes is not "a good shepherd, for he knows not his sheep;" and many of you know not him. Again, he said, "The Priests are a part of my body; they are my hands," &c. And, truly, they are his hands, by which he takes up your money, and gathers it under various pretexts. Jesus Christ says that the "good shepherd feeds his sheep," with the divine word; but Mr. Hughes feeds them that are able to buy tickets to be permitted to hear his voice. And this is the man who wishes to abridge your freedom in this land of liberty. My blood boils to think, that after escaping all the kingly and priestly oppressions of European despots,

this man should endeavor to hold us in the same vile servitude IN THE LAND OF WASHINGTON. Well did your fellow-catholics in Newark say, that such a Bishop as Mr. Hughes ought to be deposed from exercising any office over American citizens. No, brethren, remember that you are in a free land, and maintain your freedom.

The Pope who gave Ireland to the tyrant Henry II, has also given America to his Priests. And will you, my brothers, by yielding to their vile schemes, aid them in their efforts to enslave this glorious land of freedom? Here they cannot now harm you. There are no tortures and inquisitions here. And you may safely laugh their excommunications in the face. But by aiding those men to enslave this land, you are aiding them to regain their power over you and your children. Can you, will you do this? Merciful God! will you, O brethren, aid them to do this? They wish to do it, and they will do it, so soon as they have the power. The "Hireling" who told you that he knew you not, but only knew his priests, will soon, however, make you know him, if he once regains over you the power which the priests possess in Europe. I charge you, then, if you love the sacred country of freedom—the country to which you fled when you fled from tyranny—the noble country of your adoption, *never yield your rights and the rights of your children, to the corrupt priesthood of Rome.* Maintain the rights which this country has guarantied to you, and God will sustain you in maintaining them. God is not on the side of oppression, but of freedom. I cannot express myself in your language so fully and clearly as I wish, for it is but a little while since I reached these shores; but, while I live, I will sound the note of warning in the ears of my brethren who have escaped from foreign bondage, and whom priestly despots would here again enslave.

O Merciful Father! who hast led these sheep of

fold from the land of despotism to this happy land—thou who hast said that there shall be one fold and one shepherd, look upon thy flock here, now tossed about by the cunning craftiness of wicked men who wish to make a prey of them!! O deliver them from their wiles! Lead them into that path marked out by our Great Shepherd, Jesus Christ, and his Apostles, and let not their enemies sever them from thee.

And you, my faithful brethren, who walk in the path of Jesus Christ, pray for me to that God who has converted me to himself, that I may be aided in my efforts to bring my brethren to the true faith of Jesus Christ.—Amen.

STEPHEN SPOCHYNSKI,
Polish Pastor.

O Merciful Father! who hast led these sheep of mine to freedom. I cannot express myself as I wish, for it is but a little while since I reached these shores; but while I live, I will sound the note of warning in the ears of my brethren who have escaped from foreign bondage, and whom I earnestly desire would here again enslave.

O Merciful Father! who hast led these sheep of mine



Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Jan. 2006

PreservationTechnologies

A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

BX1767

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 017 285 824 7

